

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

The specification has been amended as required.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to obviate the Examiner's Section 112 rejection. Similar amendments have been made in claims 8 and 14.

The allowability of claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 12 has been noted.

The applicant's main claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of allowable claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 has been canceled as redundant.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11 and 13-18 in view of the indicated amendment of claim 1. The Examiner's reference (EP 0611811) does not disclose the applicant's invention as defined by amended claim 1, as the Examiner has recognized. Since all the other rejected claims depend from claim 1, these also should be distinguished from the EP reference and consequently, should be allowable thereover.

New claims 19, 20, 21 and 22 represent independent versions of claims 3, 5, 7 and 8, respectively. Since original claims 3, 5, 7 and 8 were indicated to be allowable, the corresponding independent claims should be allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, it is believed that all of the applicant's claims, including the newly added ones, distinguish patentably over EP 0611811 and should be allowable.

Since the Examiner has recognized that the applicant's invention as claimed is patentable over the cited art, detailed comment on the EP reference is not thought necessary. As evident from the applicant's disclosure, the present invention addresses the problem of devising ink jet printing inks which satisfy the many demanding performance requirements placed upon them by this technology. Thermal ink jet printers are notoriously "temperamental" because the heating of the ink during the injection process can easily form deposits which block the tiny printer nozzles. Typically these nozzles are half the diameter of a human hair. Thus, this represents a major challenge to ink manufacturers. The inks are also required to form discrete droplets on the substrate to give sharp images. Page 1 of the applicant's specification sets out some of the problems faced by workers in the ink jet field. There is nothing in the prior art relied

on by the Examiner (EP 0611811) which would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the subject matter of the present application without the exercise of inventive skill. For example, as the Examiner has recognized, EP 0611811 does not disclose, or teach the incorporation of, hydroxyl groups as substituents for R^1 and R^2 in Formula (1). It is, therefore, submitted that the present application is inventive over the prior art cited as called for in claim 1. The same conclusion is true with respect to the applicant's other newly added independent claims.

Allowance is thought to be in order and is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP


By _____

Paul N. Kokulis
Reg. No. 16773

Date: December 12, 2003

Customer No. 09629

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001
Direct: (202) 739-5455